

D
on a wire through the drying section [constituting means for controlling the moisture gradient in the thickness direction of the paper web between the paper web surfaces] such that [a moisture profile in a direction of thickness of the paper web is controlled and] the tendency of the paper web to curl is prevented in the run of the paper web through the drying section.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-13, 16-30 are active in this application and claims 1, 3, 5-6, 18-22 and 27-30 stand allowed.

Claims 8-13, 16-17 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wedel in view of Wywailowski et al. and claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wedel in view of Wywailowski et al. and further in view of Skaugen et al.

All of the rejected claims depend directly or indirectly from independent apparatus claim 8. Claim 8 is directed to a dryer section including at least one drying section group comprising a plurality of drying cylinders for drying a paper web having opposed bottom and top sides, a drying wire running over the drying cylinders and pressing the bottom side of the paper web against heated surfaces of the drying cylinders, and at least one steam box arranged in the drying group and comprising a counter-face which, together with a free face of the paper web, defines a contact-free

~~Steam~~-treatment gap.

In this amendment, claim 8 has been amended to set forth features of independent claim 1 which the Examiner indicated is allowable over the prior art of record. Specifically, claim 8 now recites that the steam box is positioned in a location after the bottom side of the web has separated from one of the heated surfaces of the drying cylinders and applies steam at that location "onto the bottom side of the web to raise the temperature of the bottom side of the web and control a moisture gradient in a direction of thickness of the paper web between the paper web sides substantially across an entire width of the paper web." Reference is made to the applicant's prior amendment filed April 25, 1994 discussing this feature.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art references teach or suggest the above-described features, for which reason the Examiner indicated that claim 1 stands allowed.

Further, in a telephone discussion with the Examiner on October 26, 1994, the Examiner indicated that claim 8 amended as set forth above, previously forwarded to the Examiner for review, would patentably define over the prior art of record.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 8-13, 16, 17 and 23-26 has been overcome and should be removed and that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Moreover, it is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 in response to the last Office

Action dated July 26, 1994, which made final rejections as to claims 8-13, 16, 17 and 23-26, in view of the incorporation of subject matter in allowed claim 1 into independent claim 8. It is believed that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance and accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the application in light thereof are respectfully requested.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG, RASKIN & DAVIDSON

By: 

Brian Roffe
Reg. No. 35,336

Steinberg, Raskin & Davidson
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800